

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuno. The claims recite a mobile robot, a first remote station, and a second remote station. The Examiner has stated that the image display or screen of the robot is a second remote station. This interpretation of what is a second station is contrary both the specification and the terms of the claims themselves.

As discussed on pages 20-22 and shown in Fig. 9 of the above entitled application, the disclosed system includes a mobile robot and two remote stations. A first or primary station can be controlled by a teacher or master. The second station receives the same input from the mobile robot as the first station. This allows, for example, a student to see the same image as the teacher. The specification does not describe or suggest a system wherein the secondary remote station is actually part of the mobile robot. This would make no sense, for if a person was looking at the screen of the mobile robot they would not need to view the image captured by the robot. To emphasize the physical separation between the remote stations and the mobile robot, the claims has been amended to recite that these stations are separate from the robot.

Even if the screen of Kuno is considered a second station, it still does not meet the limitations of the claims. The claims recite a camera that captures a video image and a second remote station that displays the video image. The screen of the Kuno robot does not display the image captured by its own camera. The screen of the Kuno robot is not a second remote station that has a second monitor that also displays the video image captured by the robot camera as recited in the claims. The screen of the Kuno robot is clearly not a second


remote station as the term is used in the claims and the specification of the above entitled application. Kuno does not anticipate claims 1 – 36 because this reference does not disclose a second remote station.

In view of the above it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims 1 - 36 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

Dated: May 17, 2006



Ben York, Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive
Suite 400
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Telephone: (949) 760-0991

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the U.S. Mail, First Class, addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 17, 2006.



Susan Langworthy Date May 17, 2006

Application No. 10/660,862
Atty. Docket No. 157438-0007
1497258